



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

defendant to break this contract and enter into a similar one with him. The plaintiff sues for breach of this second contract. *Held*, that the contract was illegal, and the plaintiff may not recover. *Wanderers Hockey Club v. Johnson*, 25 West. L. R. 434 (Brit. Col.). For a discussion of the question involved, see NOTES, p. 273.

ILLEGAL CONTRACTS — CONTRACTS AGAINST PUBLIC POLICY — PRIVATE AGREEMENT OF DIRECTOR WITH STOCKHOLDER. — The B. Co., being in financial straits, by an agreement approved in general meeting voted to allow the defendant two representatives on the board of directors in return for his providing additional capital. Accordingly, the defendant made the plaintiff a director of the B. Co., and privately contracted to pay him £200 yearly so long as he remained on the board, but it was not contemplated that the plaintiff should promote the defendant's interests as distinguished from those of the shareholders as a whole. *Held*, that the plaintiff may recover on the contract. *Kregor v. Hollins*, 109 L. T. R. 225 (Ct. of App., Oct. 18, 1913).

A contract by an employee with a third party to assume a position which might lead him to act to his employer's prejudice is illegal. *Rice v. Wood*, 113 Mass. 133; *Goodell v. Hurlbut*, 5 N. Y. App. Div. 77. The agreement being calculated to bias the agent's mind, that it does not in fact do so is immaterial. *Harrington v. The Victoria Graving Dock Co.*, 3 Q. B. D. 549. The situation of the corporation director is analogous, for to him the shareholders look for disinterested transaction of corporate business. *West v. Camden*, 135 U. S. 507. Wherever an employer fully apprised of this other interest of his employee clearly assents thereto, the contract is unobjectionable. *Rice v. Wood*, *supra*; *Bell v. McConnell*, 37 Ohio St. 396. But there must be unmistakable evidence that the employer assented, having a full knowledge of all the facts. *Marshall v. Reed*, 32 Pa. Super. Ct. 60. The court reasons that the contract sued on is not void as against public policy, because of the fact that the original agreement by the B. Co. with the defendant must have contemplated that the latter would contract to pay his directors. But this is accepting as a substitute something less than the full disclosure regularly required to validate a dual agency.

INTERNATIONAL LAW — NATURE AND EXTENT OF SOVEREIGNTY — JURISDICTION OVER VESSELS. — Death was caused by the explosion of a boiler on a Michigan vessel in the Canadian waters of the Great Lakes. *Held*, that the law of Michigan governs. *Thompson T. & W. Ass'n. v. McGregor*, 207 Fed. 209 (C. C. A. Sixth Circ.).

For a discussion of the jurisdiction over vessels, see this issue of the REVIEW, at p. 268.

INTOXICATING LIQUORS — LEGISLATION — INTERPRETATION: APPLICATION OF PROHIBITIONS AGAINST SELLING AND TRANSPORTING TO THE PURCHASER OR HIS AGENT. — A city ordinance prohibited the sale or transportation of intoxicating liquors. The defendant, acting as agent, purchased and carried to his principals some whiskey sold in violation of the ordinance. He was indicted for transporting contraband liquors. *Held*, that the prohibition against the transportation does not apply to the buyer's agent. *City of Anderson v. Fant*, 79 S. E. 641 (S. C.).

It has been held that a statute prohibiting the sale of liquor does not apply to the purchaser, because, by prohibiting only selling, it impliedly excludes buying from its scope. *State v. Rand*, 51 N. H. 361. See *Commonwealth v. Willard*, 22 Pick. (Mass.) 476, 479. The buyer, however, is not indicted for the act of buying, but as a principal in causing the crime of selling. And one

aiding in the sale has been held where the act was not that of buying. *Johnson v. People*, 83 Ill. 431. Nevertheless, the buyer is generally not held. *Lott v. United States*, 205 Fed. 28. The principal case gives an explanation that if the buyer were held in prosecuting the seller, he could not then be forced to testify to the sale because of self-incrimination. But this interpretation of the statute is valid only if such an intention may be implied. And it seems improbable that such positive considerations of policy were present in the minds of the legislators. Rather, it would seem that since the statute was enacted to protect the buyer from himself there was an entire absence of intent to make him liable under it. *Cf. Regina v. Tyrell*, [1894] 1 Q. B. 710. If the buyer is not liable for the act of buying, he is surely exempt from liability for an act so necessarily consequent upon buying as the transportation of the goods purchased. The principal case seems correct in extending this exemption to the agent of the buyer. *Cf. Bonds v. State*, 130 Ala. 117, 30 So. 427; *Campbell v. State*, 79 Ala. 271.

LEGACIES AND DEVISES — MARSHALLING ASSETS — EXONERATION OF SPECIFIC DEVISEE FROM COVENANT RUNNING WITH THE LAND. — A lessor covenanted for himself and assigns to erect a building on the demised premises on demand by the lessee. The latter promptly demanded performance, but without success. Eight years later the lessor died, having specifically devised the reversion. His executor, upon a fresh demand, performed the covenant, and now seeks reimbursement from the specific devisee. Held, that the executor cannot recover. *In re Hughes*, [1913] 2 Ch. 491.

As the covenant bound both the devisee and the executor, the question is simply which must exonerate the other. The result is probably correct on the ground that the covenant had become an overdue obligation of the testator before his death. *Barry v. Harding*, 1 J. & L. 475; *Fitzwilliam v. Kelly*, 10 Hare 266. But the court's reasoning would be equally applicable, if no demand had been made before that time. It is found that the covenant "was intended to be performed forthwith" and not "to remain attendant on the lease during its currency," and held that the burden of a covenant so intended must fall on the general estate. *Eccles v. Mills*, [1898] A. C. 360. The legal principle laid down is probably sound. Where land contracted for is specifically devised, the executor must discharge it from the vendor's claim for the piece. *Cogswell v. Cogswell*, 2 Edw. Ch. (N. Y.) 231. And a covenant by either party to a lease to make some immediate improvement — intended to be finally performed and over with shortly after the outset of the tenancy — may fairly be treated as a price paid for the reversionary or leasehold interest, which the covenantor acquires. *Marshall v. Holloway*, 5 Sim. 196. The principle also harmonizes with the rule that equity — which prescribes the order of marshalling assets — will impose the burden of a contract upon the land or the promisor according to the original intent of the parties in making it. *Mansel v. Norton*, 22 Ch. D. 769; *John Brothers Abergarw Brewery Co. v. Holmes*, [1900] 1 Ch. 188. But a covenant imposing a contingent liability which may persist for years must be intended to "remain attendant on the lease." The mere expectation that it will be performed soon does not alter the character of the covenantor's promise. To treat such an agreement like the temporary, unconditional covenant of *Eccles v. Mills* would probably violate the testator's intent and certainly cause serious inconvenience. The early English rule that a specific bequest of stock not fully paid up carried with it the right to have future calls met by the executor has been abandoned for these very reasons. *Blount v. Hopkins*, 7 Sim. 43; *Armstrong v. Burnet*, 20 Beav. 424; *Addams v. Ferick*, 26 Beav. 384. Probably the court would not have carried its reasoning in the principal case to its logical result of holding the executor had the demand been made after the testator's death.